REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sawada* (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,317).

Claims 3-6, 11-14 and 19 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 15 and 19 by this amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 5, 6, 13, 14 and 19 are made to correct minor informalities in claims 5, 6, 13, 14 and 19. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments are not intended to alter the scope of claims 5, 6, 13, 14 and 19. Thus, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter as a result of these amendments.

Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain currently pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 3-6, 11-14 and 19 would be allowable as noted at paragraph 5 of the Office Action. However, claims 1, 2, 7-10, 15-18, 20 and 21 also are believed to be allowable for at least the following reasons.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the limitation "the delay source data," as recited in claim 15, at line 3 has insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended claim 15 to address the Examiner's concerns. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, the Examiner's consideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sawada*. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Sawada* does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 because *Sawada* does not disclose all of the features of these claims. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least "detecting a driving frequency of source data for a current frame," and "adjusting the reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency to modulate the source data." It is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* also fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 8 including at least "assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the driving frequency to the reference modulated data to adjust the reference modulated data, thereby modulating the source data."

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 10 including at least "a modulator selecting

reference modulated data from previously registered data and adjusting the selected reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency," and the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 17 including at least "a modulator selecting reference modulated data from previously registered data, setting a different weighting value for each frequency band having a plurality of frequency ranges, and assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the detected frequency to the reference modulated data."

Further, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 20 including at least "a modulator selecting reference modulated data from previously registered data and adjusting the selected reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency."

An embodiment of the present invention as claimed includes the feature of detecting a driving frequency of source data and adjusting a reference modulated data to generate a modulated source data, that is not taught or suggested by *Sawada*.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention as a whole, *Sawada* discloses a display mode detector (15) for discriminating the current display mode on the basis of the timings, polarities, and the like of the vertical and horizontal synchronizing signals, and a clock generator (17) for generating a dot clock signal (41) in accordance with the discrimination result of the display mode detector (15). *Sawada* also discloses an ADC (13) for sampling an RGB analog signal at the timing of the dot clock signal to generate a quantized digital RGB image data, and an interpolation processing circuit (16) for expanding the image defined by the input digital RGB image data in the vertical direction in correspondence with the display mode.

The Office Action appears to assert that elements (14, 15 and 17) of *Sawada* detect a driving frequency of source data. However, *Sawada* teaches that element 14 is a clock generator,

element 15 is a display mode detector, and element 17 is a display mode dependence controller. See, for example, FIG. 1 of *Sawada*. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that elements (14, 15 and 17) of *Sawada* do not detect the driving frequency of the source data. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* fails to teach or suggest detecting a driving frequency of source data, as set forth in Applicant's claimed combinations.

Further, the Office Action appears to assert that the interpolation processing circuit (16) of *Sawada* adjusts a reference modulated data. However, *Sawada* discloses that the interpolation processing circuit (16) expands data in a vertical direction in correspondence with the display mode. See, for example, column 5, lines 57-60 of *Sawada*. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* also fails to teach or suggest adjusting the reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency, or assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the detected frequency to the reference modulated data, as set forth in Applicant's claimed combinations.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Applicant respectfully submits that since *Sawada* does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 20 and 21, *Sawada* does not anticipate claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 20 and 21. Further, since claims 2, 7, 9, 16, and 18 depend from claims 1, 8, 10 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that *Sawada* also does not anticipate claims 2, 7, 9, 16 and 18. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this

response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the

number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also

be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____
Victoria D. Hao
Registration No. 47,630

Dated: September 5, 2003

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001